REMARKS

Claims 1-67 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 31-49 were withdrawn from further consideration, and claims 1-30 and 50-67 were rejected. With this amendment, claim 31 is amended. On the basis of the following remarks, reinstatement of claims 31-49 and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Withdrawn Claims

The examiner withdrew claims 31-49 from further consideration on the basis that claims 31-49 were not directed to Species I, which the examiner characterized as being directed to: "media processing system resides at least in part on the printing system and at least in part on the network device." It was Applicants' original position that claims 31-49 were directed to a system in which a media processing system resides at least in part on the printing system and at least in part on the network device. However, in view of the examiner's withdrawal of these claims, the claims have been amended to make clear that they are indeed directed to a system in which the media processing is performed at least partially by the printing system and at least partially by the network device. Because claims 31-49 are now clearly directed to Species I, Applicants respectfully request reinstatement of the withdrawn claims for consideration in this application. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as provided below.

Rejected Claims

Each of the claims being examined has been rejected as anticipated or made obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,106,457 to Perkins by itself, or made obvious by Perkins and U.S. Patent No. 5,093,730 to Ishii et al., either by themselves or in combination with other references. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

One distinguishing feature of the claimed invention is media processing that is distributed between the printer and one or more network devices. Further, the claimed media processing is performed on the content of the time-based media; the processing is more than mere decoding, transcoding, or scaling of the media. The processing, as claimed, uses content recognition on the time-based media to produce the printed representation based on the recognized content. This is contrasted with the types of processing that can be performed by a printer in any of the cited references, which are mere decoding, transcoding, scaling, and other types of processing that are independent of the actual content or meaning contained within the media.

In the previous response, Applicants argued that the cited references do not disclose this claimed content recognition processing distributed across a printer and a network device. In the subsequent Office Action, the examiner agreed that the cited references did not disclose higher level processing done by the printing system. Specifically, the examiner acknowledged that "the printer of Ishii only perform[s] processing such as decoding, transcoding, scaling that are independent of the actual content of the media." However, the examiner maintained that the claimed invention did not have these distinguishing features. Specifically, the examiner stated: "The examiner has not found the limitation in the claims that would indicate the processing part of the print system that would perform any processing other than decoding, transcoding, scaling etc."

Applicants respectfully maintain that these distinguishing features are recited in the claims. To assist the examiner, Applicants point to the following limitations in the claims:

> Claim 1: "a media processing system . . . configured to recognize content contained within the time-based media and determine a printed representation of the time-based media based on the recognized content . . . the media processing system resides at least in part on the printing system"
>
> Claim 31 (as amended): "wherein the computing device and the printing device are configured to perform media processing in cooperation to recognize content contained

within the time-based media and to produce the printed representation based on the recognized content . . . wherein the media processing is performed at least partially by the printing system"

Claim 50: "the processing performed at least in part within a printing system . . . wherein the processing comprises recognizing content contained within the time-based media and producing the printed representation based on the recognized content"

Clearly, the claims do recite the processing of actual content of the media (beyond mere decoding, transcoding, scaling, etc.) that is performed at least partially by the print system. Since the examiner has acknowledged that the cited references do not disclose this claimed feature, the claims must be patentable over those references.

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the examiner believes for any reason direct contact would help advance the prosecution of this case to allowance, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER E. HART, JONATHAN J. HULL, JAMEY GRAHAM, AND KURT PIERSOL

Dated: February 24, 2007

By: /Robert A. Hulse/

Robert A. Hulse, Reg. No. 48,473
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2444
Fax: (415) 281-1350